*Mr. B. Narasinga Rao.*—Shall we take the reply of Government to be that a draft bill is under preparation?

*Dewan.*—Information is being collected with a view to draft a bill.

SUBJECT No. 51.

(1) Exemption of the Malnad people from the operations of the Arms Regulation.

Mr. Eregowda, South Mysore Native Planters' Association.

(2) Grant of exemption from Arms Act to raiyats paying large kandayam.

Messrs. Mir Mahomed Sab, Tarikere Taluk, and SyedKhaja Peeran, Muslim Association, Tarikere.

*Mr. Mohamed Sab.*—With a view to protect their property it is desirable to exempt the people of the Malnad from the operation of the Arms Regulation.

He said that though frequent reminders were issued for the renewal of the licenses reply was not received.

*Mr. Ananthiah.*—Though applications are made repeatedly, they are being held up in the Police Department, when sent for report. If a man keeps any arms without a license, the police officers at once arrest him.

*Dewan.*—Whole sale exemption is not possible. Orders will issue simplifying procedure for the grant of licenses and requiring that applications for renewals should be dealt with without further enquiry and first applications disposed of with the least possible delay.

*Mr. C. Rasool Khan.*—Those who pay a kandayam of more than Rs. 30 annually should be given a license. Others should not be given.

SUBJECT No. 52.

Legislation against cattle lifting.

Messrs. B. Kesaviah, Chikmagalur Taluk, and Thippiah, Challakere Taluk.

Necessary legislation may be passed immediately to prevent cattle lifting by wicked people for the sake of hides, placing the trade under proper control and requiring the hides to be punched before sale.

SUBJECT No. 53.

Exclusion of women from the operation of Act XIII of 1859.

Mr. Srinivasa Rao, Chikmagalur Taluk.

The Dewan said that the matter had already been considered and a draft bill was under the consideration of Government.

*Reply of Government.*—The bill is under preparation.

SUBJECT No. 54.

Repeal of the Insolvency Regulation.

Messrs. Padmanna, Chandrasekhariah and K. Venkatasamiah, Nanjangud Taluk.

*Mr. K. Venkatasamiah.*—There is considerable difference between the old and the new Insolvency Regulation. The old Regulation was better, but the new Regulation has been passed without the opinions of the Bar Associations and of the Judges being obtained, and we have to make the best of it. I shall give a list of the points in which modification is necessary. Action may be taken to have the regulation modified. The best thing would be to revive the old regulation. If that was not possible, the new one may be modified.

*Mr. C. S. Doraswami Iyer.*—Where is there anything like the old Regulation?

*Mr. Venkatasamiah.*—I mean the portion of the Civil Procedure Code relating to this matter.

*Mr. C. Subba Rao.*—The Regulation makes no provision for the appointment of an Official Receiver.

*Mr. C. S. Doraswami Iyer.*—Government are aware of the defects and amendments to the Regulation are under consideration. If members forward their suggestions, Government will consider them all in that connection.

SUBJECT No. 55.

Amendment of the Village Courts Regulation.

(1) Mr. T. G. Nagappa, Tumkur District Board.
(2) Messrs. H. Venkataramiah, C. Krishna Rao and H. Ramakrishniah, Tumkur Municipality.
(3) Messrs. Anantarajappa and Anantalakshminaranappa, Tumkur Taluk.
(4) Mr. Hutchvere Gowda, Gubbi Taluk.

*Summary of discussion*—(1) Village Courts may be empowered to take cognizance of all kinds of civil disputes involving claims of the value of not more than Rs. 20.

(2) The Village Courts Regulation may be amended so as to allow suits falling under the Regulation to be filed also in places where the cause of action arises.

(3) In the draft of then proposed Village Courts Regulation published on 20th October 1892 it was provided in section 8 that Village Shanbhog was to assist Village Munsiffs in clerical work and in sections from 74 to 80 the Village Munsiff was given power to take cognizance of and award penalties for certain offences under the Regulation, but these provisions were omitted in the Regulation finally passed and brought into force. They may be embodied in the Regulation to create facilities for the proper discharge of Government work.

(4) The money limit of suits cognizable by Village Courts without the consent of the defendants under the Regulation may conveniently be raised to Rs. 50.

*Mr. C. S. Doraswami Iyer.*—For individual cases of hardship, the Village Courts Regulation should not be amended. It was introduced to simplify procedure in small cases and proposals like this will make it complex and defeat its first purpose.

*Mr. Venkataramiah.*—Munsiffs' Courts may be given jurisdiction in such cases.

*Dewan.*—(1) and (2) Not possible.

(3) and (4) Government will call for particulars and if there is demand for such a change, will pass necessary orders.

SUBJECT No. 56.

Definition of "public purpose" in Land Acquisition Regulation.

Mr. B. Gundu Rao, Devanhalli Taluk

*Mr. Gundu Rao.*—"Public purpose" in the Land Acquisition Regulation should be defined.

*Dewan.*—What is the hardship in the present conditions?

*Mr. Gundu Rao.*—Acquisition is often made for doubtful purposes. This would not be possible if the words were defined.

*Mr. C. S. Doraswami Iyer.*—It is not possible to recount once for all, all possible public purposes for which acquisition may be necessary. That is why the Act explains the phrase, without defining it, to include certain objects. The phrase should be elastic.

*Mr. Gundu Rao.*—But it is misapplied.